

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on October 9, 2007 has been carefully considered. In the Office Action, Claims 12-18 stand rejected and Claims 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31 and 33 are allowed. The Applicants have amended Claim 12. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in light of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Allowed Claims

In the Office Action, Claims 19-24, 26-28, 30, 31 and 33 are allowed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to expedite prosecution, the Applicants have deleted the term “therein” from Claim 12. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 12 is rejected as being unpatentable over Tsuchihashi et al. (US Patent No. 4,955,654). In particular, it is admitted within the office action that Tsuchihashi does not disclose that a user of the peripheral device feels the force feedback. In addition, it is admitted in the office action that Tsuchihashi only discloses that it is not a conventional force feedback device because it uses speed control instead of position control. In particular, Tsuchihashi states a sensor for detecting a force (or torque) to be applied to an end effector is provided, and the

speed of a driving device of an end effector is controlled in such a manner that the result of detection obtained from the sensor is fed back to a control circuit for the driving device of the end effector so that the force (or torque) to be applied to the end effector is limited and does not exceed a predetermined level. However, unlike claim 12, there is no teaching or suggestion in Tsuchihashi of an actuator which applies a force that is felt by the user and which either impedes or enhances motion of the peripheral device in response to the force applied by the actuator, as recited in Claim 12. Tsuchihashi does not disclose or even suggest an actuator which applies a force that is felt by the user manipulating the peripheral device. Instead, all that Tsuchihashi discloses is a force sensor which determines speed control of the end effector as it closes on its target to ensure that the effector does not apply an excessive amount of torque. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Tsuchihashi that the end effector has the ability to output the force to either impede or enhance motion of a peripheral device. Support for the amendment is found on Pages 15-16 of Applicants' specification. For at least these reasons, Tsuchihashi does not disclose or suggest each and every element/limitation in Claim 12. Accordingly, Claim 12 is allowable over Tsuchihashi.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchihashi et al. in view of Rosenberg et al. (U S Patent No. 5,805,140). Claims 15-18 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tsuchihashi et al. in view of Rosenberg et al. in further view of Bailey (US Patent No. 6,062,865). The Applicants respectfully traverse. Claims 13-18 are dependent on independent Claim 12. As stated above, Claim 12 is in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Claims 13-18 are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

It is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance and early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,



Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Dated: 1/8/08
Thelen Reid Brown
Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040